

lowlands and highlands (also called “backward”, p. 204), rural and urban, and “open” and “closed” villages.

Valuable as this book is to a much-neglected topic, it has some weak spots. Clark does not consider whether court leet licensing of alesellers in some localities had any effect on the completeness of his sessional lists of alesellers. Clark is at his weakest when discussing drunkenness. Admittedly, “too little is known about levels of consumption” (p. 109), but his evidence and impressions indicate considerable consumption. Yet, he never comes to grips with the fact that very few persons were charged with drunkenness. This reviewer’s research indicates that fewer than one in 200 offenders at courts leet and quarter sessions were accused of drunkenness in Stuart England.

Clark’s stimulating book is impressively documented. He is exceptionally at home with secular and ecclesiastical manuscripts at all levels of authority and with their limitations, as well as with published primary and secondary works. The grouping of many references at the ends of paragraphs, however, annoyed this reader. The wealth of information, the encyclopedic documentation, and the sound arguments make this the standard work on early modern English alehouses. There are nine figures, twenty-one illustrations, and a useful index.

Walter J. KING  
Northern State College, South Dakota

\* \* \*

JEAN-LOUIS FLANDRIN — *Familles: Parenté, maison, sexualité dans l’ancienne société*. Paris : Éditions du Seuil, 1984.

Since the only difference between the 1976 and 1984 editions of Flandrin’s pioneering survey of families in early modern Europe (actually France and England) is an appended, up-dated bibliography, the reviewer can only assess how useful the original text still is and how useful a revised text would be.

Rereading *Familles: Parenté, maison, sexualité dans l’ancienne société* confirms initial impressions that the breadth of the undertaking, especially the attempt to combine anthropological, demographic, and “sentiments” approaches to the family, is its main contribution to the field. Although Flandrin pays homage to Lawrence Stone’s *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, his own survey remains far more nuanced, both in its awareness of variations in family forms and its sensitivity to family relationships. Conversely, the “review” edition revives earlier concern about internal contradictions in the interpretation and evidence. The contrast between its attention to the economic bases of family forms in the first chapters, and emphasis on religious reform and enlightened opinion as causes of the shift towards marital affection and parental concern in later chapters, is less acceptable since the appearance of J. Goody’s *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe* and R. Trumbach’s *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth Century England*. Neither is cited in the new bibliography. While Goody argues an economic motivation for the Church’s long-standing efforts to break down kin ties in favour of the conjugal family, Trumbach sees the economic and political security of the English aristocracy in the eighteenth century as responsible for their adoption of a domestic morality. More specifically, Flandrin contends that the new morality promoted family limitation, yet his own figures on fertility show different trends in different areas. Subsequent village studies reinforce the point that fertility can best be understood in the local economic context.

Elsewhere, too, the text would have benefited from revision in the light of the large number of specialized studies published since — and even before — 1976. In so far as Flandrin posited causal

connections between inheritance practices and family forms, his failure to incorporate new material substantiating his point, and notably Berkner's data on the stem family as a stage in the family life cycle, is disappointing. Alternatively, his focus on the transmission of property and hence the authority of the father overlooks Olwen Hufton's work on the poor in eighteenth century France and Tilly/Scott's work on the family economy, both of which might modify his opinions about the prevalence of patriarchy. His relatively rare remarks on the quality of sexual relations among the peasantry have not been amended, extended, or even justified in the light of Martine Segalen's criticisms of his equation of sex (and beauty) with love and his blindness to regional variations, which she attributes to differences in types of land-holding and social structure. One is forced to conclude that it was easier to remain the pioneer, above the important but complex issues raised by the anthropologists, demographers, and economic historians working in this field, than it was to include new evidence or reinterpret old evidence.

To conclude, the review edition of *Familles: Parenté, maison, sexualité dans l'ancienne société* is only useful as an introduction to the field of family history; it does not reflect recent scholarship and so is of little utility to specialists in that field.

Mary Lynn STEWART-McDOUGALL  
Simon Fraser University

\* \* \*

*A Woman's Life in the Court of the Sun King: The Letters of Liselotte von der Pfalz, 1652-1720.* Translated and introduced by ELBORG FORSTER. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984. Pp. lx, 287.

The palace of Versailles symbolizes glory and power, autocracy and sycophancy, magnificence and a special kind of squalor. What it does not normally evoke are images of long healthy walks, lots of fresh air, a chapter a day out of the Lutheran Bible, and a lifelong passion for smoked sausages and sauerkraut. Yet these habits, along with a keen mind and a down-to-earth common sense, characterize the very unusual lady who was Madame, the sister-in-law of Louis XIV.

Married at the age of nineteen to the homosexual Duc d'Orleans (whose first wife was reputed to have been poisoned by his favourites), Liselotte von der Pfalz brought little to her marriage but a strong constitution and a happy memory of her upbringing in a minor German court. Both of these she conserved for fifty-one lonely and frustrated years of exile from her homeland.

The life of a French "royal" was not an easy one. "The sons of France," wrote Louis XIV, "must never have any home but the court nor any resource but the love of their brother" (p. xl). Forbidden to travel without the King, Monsieur and Madame were tied together forever in the closed world of the court, totally alien to each other, vying with each other for the favour of the King who alone could dictate how they were to live and bring up their children. From this claustrophobic atmosphere, Liselotte found escape only in her correspondence with her German relations. The result is a collection of letters seething with impatience, anger and homesickness, yet totally involved in the business at hand, the work of being a royal princess. "As for getting out of this business altogether," she wrote in 1702, after she had become a widow, "that is quite out of the question; my calling and filial obedience have brought me here, and here I must live and die" (p. 145). As if to show how much she valued the *métier*, she composed rich descriptions of life at court, in all its colour, pomp and protocol. To let it down, by unworthy and shoddy behaviour, was in her mind the unforgivable crime.